REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0128047 (Gates) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0208927 (Wong) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030236769 (Pyhalammi). Claims 11 – 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyhalammi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078981 (Harms).

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims **1, 6, 11 and 14** to further clarify the invention. Claims 1 – 16 remain pending in the present application.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 1 – 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gates in view of Wong and Pyhalammi. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, none of the cited references disclose or suggest sending the message containing contact data for the selected contacts to the group of mobile phones using the mobile phone messaging service. The Examiner asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Gates in Figures 4A, B and 5, and paragraph 63. However, these portions merely disclose that a user may select a chosen contact from a contact name list and activate a short cut key to either <u>compose an email message and send</u> it to the chosen contact or <u>initiate a telephone call</u> to <u>the chosen single contact</u>. This is not sending the message containing contact data for the selected contacts <u>to the group of mobile phones</u> using the mobile phone messaging service, as recited in the claims of the present application. Gates merely discloses accessing a list of contacts, highlighting <u>one contact</u> and then using a short cut key to either <u>compose an email message having a recipient address field with the selected contact or initiate a telephone call to</u>

the selected contact. Gates does not disclose or suggest sending the message <u>to a</u> <u>group of mobile phones</u>.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest adding contact data for the selected contacts from the mobile phone contact list to a message, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner admits that Gates does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Wong in Fig. 2 and 5 and paragraphs 0018 and 0028. However, these portions merely disclose retrieving <u>the name of the recipient</u> from the contact register and <u>inserting the name</u> into the message prior to sending, and where the name of a contact or recipient can be inserted into a pre-configured birthday greeting electronic message and sent to the contact/recipient when the current date is the birthday of the contact/recipient. This is not <u>adding contact data for the selected contacts from the</u> <u>mobile phone contact list to a message</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. Wong merely discloses adding a contact name into an electronic birthday greeting.

Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the message containing control data identifying the message as containing a contact list. The Examiner admits that neither Gates nor Wong disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Pyhalammi discloses these limitations in Fig. 5b, 522, 524, 527-529, 532 and paragraph 0034. However, these portions merely disclose an example of the structure of the feedback message that includes a first identifier field SMS start, which indicates that the message starts from that record, a second identifier field 522, on the basis of which the feedback message can be recognized by the receiver of the message, and fields 524, 528, 532 containing contact information, such as name, number or address information, and identifier fields 523, 527, 529 associated with said fields, on the basis of which the contents of the fields containing contact information can be stored in the right place at the reception end, and that the number of contact information fields in the feedback message depends on the number of fields indicated in the request message and the total number of contact information items available, and that the feedback message comprises the record field 533, which indicates that the message ends at the record in question. This is not the

message <u>containing control data identifying the message as containing a contact list</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. Pyhalammi merely relates to a first device sending a request to a second device based on first contact information for the second device <u>for second contact information related to the first contact information</u> and the second device sending a feedback message with second contact information of the second device that is related to the first contact information. Thus, Pyhalammi relates to the <u>first contact information and the second contact information being related to each other and to the second device</u>. This is not a message containing <u>a contact list</u>. Morever, Pyhalammi does not disclose or suggest a message containing control data <u>identifying the message as containing a contact list</u>.

Regarding claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 10, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 6 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1 – 10 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 11 – 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyhalammi in view of Harms. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 11 and 14, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, determining whether the received message contains data for a contact list and, if so, launching an application specific software program to manage the received data for a contact list, otherwise handling the received message normally. The Examiner asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Pyhalammi in Fig. 1, 3 a-b, 5a-b, paragraphs 0022-0023, 0031-0034, 0012, and 0025. However, these portions merely disclose what has been noted previous, that Pyhalammi relates to a first device sending a request to a second device based on first contact information for

the second device for second contact information related to the first contact information and the second device sending a feedback message with second contact information of the second device that is related to the first contact information. None of the cited portions of Pyhalammi, or any other portions, disclose or suggest determining whether the received message contains data for a contact list. As noted previously, the first contact information and the second contact information are related and are sent and received separately and are not a contact list. Further, there is no determination in Pyhalammi of whether the received message contains data for a contact list. Moreover, the cited references do not disclose if so, launching an application specific software program to manage the received data for a contact list, otherwise handling the received message normally, as recited in the claims of the present application. Pyhalammi merely discloses requesting additional contact information based on stored contact information, receiving the additional (second) contact information, and associating the first and second contact information with each other. Moreover, Harms does not overcome the substantial defects noted regarding Pyhalammi.

Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, and 16, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 11 or 14 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 11 – 16 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Northcutt
(Applicant)

Date: January 5, 2009

Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199